

Background Paper

Toward Measurement of Civic Service

Fengyan Tang, Amanda Moore McBride, and Michael Sherraden

Research Background Paper

September 2003



**Global Service Institute
Center for Social Development**



 **Washington**
WASHINGTON · UNIVERSITY · IN · ST · LOUIS
George Warren Brown School of Social Work

Toward Measurement of Civic Service

Fengyan Tang
Amanda Moore McBride
Michael Sherraden

Research Background Paper

2003

Global Service Institute
Center for Social Development
George Warren Brown School of Social Work
Washington University in St. Louis
One Brookings Drive, Campus Box 1196
St. Louis, Missouri USA 63130
1-314-935-8827 phone, 1-314-935-8661 fax
gsi@gwbmail.wustl.edu
<http://gwbweb.wustl.edu/csd/gsi>

SUPPORT FOR THIS PAPER HAS BEEN PROVIDED BY THE FORD FOUNDATION

We thank Hsi-Sheng Wei for assistance in the collection of the surveys and Timothy Broesamle for formatting and production of the report. Lissa Johnson and Carlos Benitez provided helpful comments on the paper.

About the Global Service Institute and the Measurement of Civic Service

The Center for Social Development at Washington University in St. Louis and Innovations in Civic Participation in Washington, DC, started the Global Service Institute (GSI) in March 2001. The primary objectives of GSI are to build a global knowledge base and understanding of civic service and to assist with the design and implementation of policies and programs worldwide. GSI supports the development of a global research agenda, hosts a Web-based information network, and supports innovations in policy and program development. The Ford Foundation provided the initial grant to begin GSI.

The emphasis of GSI is on civic (non-military) service. In the first ever global assessment of civic service, we found service programs on every continent, operating in at least 57 nations. Programs are transnational, international, national, and local in scope. They involve servers from every age group, and some intentionally recruit servers from different cultural and economic groups. Civic service is prevalent and appears to be an emerging societal institution used to train and educate servers, promote cultural integration, and address critical social and economic needs within and across villages, communities, and nations.

A goal of GSI's research agenda is to advance an understanding of civic service worldwide, contributing to a rigorous knowledge base for decision-making. Toward this end, we suggest a focus on the conceptualization and operationalization of civic service in order to assess its nature and prevalence across nations and cultures. In this background paper, we define civic service across the continuum of volunteerism, and recommend that service role and institutional linkages to the service role be defining aspects. We then review volunteerism surveys to inform how civic service can be measured. We include draft survey items. We hope that this review will generate ideas for how to define and measure civic service at the program level and the national level. We welcome your feedback.

Michael Sherraden
Director
Center for Social Development

1. Defining and Measuring Civic Service

Volunteering and civic service are global phenomena (Kelen, 1985; McBride, Benitez, & Sherraden, 2003; Menon, Moore, & Sherraden, 2002; Salamon & Sokolowski, 2001). However, scholarly attention toward volunteering and civic service are only recently emerging. For example, interest in the definition and assessment of occasional volunteerism has increased greatly in the past decade (Carson, 1999; Cnaan & Amroffell, 1994; Cnaan, Handy, & Wadsworth, 1996).

What is volunteering? How prevalent is it? What forms does it take? Answers to these questions differ by nation and culture (Anheier & Salamon, 1999). To assist with answering these questions, a “measurement toolkit” was developed for the United Nations (Dingle, Sokolowski, Saxon-Harrold, Smith, & Leigh, 2001). The toolkit recommends contextual development of a clear definition of volunteerism, and from a given definition, methods and questions are detailed to help assess its status and influences.

Episodic and occasional volunteering tends to be the focus of volunteerism scholarship (Dingle et al., 2001; Wilson & Musick, 1999). This form of volunteerism may result from individual initiative and may not require a program structure for its performance, nor substantial commitments of time on a regular basis. There may be no defined end-point, with the individual volunteering sporadically or occasionally. Examples of episodic volunteering include taking an elderly neighbor to the doctor, re-building a village member’s hut, serving as a committee chairperson for an organization, or participating in a highway clean-up program.

But what about more formal, intensive, volunteering, which occurs through structured programs? We refer to this form of volunteerism as civic service. Program examples include the European Voluntary Service, the Peace Corps, the Japanese Overseas Cooperation Volunteers, and national service programs in Ghana and Nigeria. For civic service, there is even less conceptualization, assessment of status, rigorous research, and cross-national comparison (Grantmaker Forum on Community and National Service, 2000; McBride, Benitez, & Sherraden, 2003; Perry & Imperial, 2001).

Similar to the United Nations’ toolkit for defining and measuring volunteerism, this paper proposes a definition and conceptualization of civic service. From this definition, key aspects of civic service are identified, and then large-scale surveys that measure volunteerism are reviewed to assess how these aspects may be measured. We propose specific items that may capture civic service across nations and cultures.

Conceptualizing Civic Service

There is extensive debate about what volunteerism is and is not, and there is no clear consensus among scholars or citizens (Anheier & Salamon, 1999; Carson, 1999; Cnaan & Amroffell, 1994; Cnaan, Handy, & Wadsworth, 1996; Salamon & Sokolowski, 2001). Moreover, there are historical, cultural, and legal determinants of volunteerism in any given nation or culture, which further compounds the possibility for consensus (Carson, 1999; Handy, Cnaan, Brudney, Ascoli,

Meijs, & Ranade, 2000). Nevertheless, social science requires that states of reality and phenomena be defined and measured.

Key aspects of volunteerism have been identified that can help to establish boundaries and specify the nature of this phenomenon. Differences in the forms of volunteerism can be distinguished by structure, auspice and organizational host, compulsion or free choice, time commitment, intended beneficiaries or activities, and remuneration or recognition (Cnaan & Amroffell, 1994; Cnaan, Handy, & Wadsworth, 1996). Civic service varies in these aspects, and can be construed as falling at one end of a volunteerism continuum that ranges from informal and sporadic to formal and intensive (Davis Smith, 2002).

Structure. Civic service is a structured, intensive form of long-term volunteering. It is implemented through programs operated by organizations or governments. Programs create a service role that is filled by an individual. The role is defined with expectations about service performance and outcomes. Civic service has roots in military or national service programs, as well as in missionary or international faith-based service (Sherraden & Eberly, 1990).

Auspice and organizational host. Civic service is unique in that programs may be sponsored by governments under the auspices of national or transnational policy. Governments may sanction and support the programs and may even implement them. In some national service programs, non-governmental organizations host the service experience, recruiting, training, and managing the servers. In fact, across a range of civic service programs, non-governmental organizations were found to be both the auspice and the hosts of service (McBride, Benitez, & Sherraden, 2003).

Compulsory/voluntary nature. Volunteering in the narrowest sense is non-coerced action (Van Til, 1988). However, participation may be compulsory in national service programs and in service-learning programs at secondary or university levels. However, in a recent global assessment of civic service, of the 210 programs identified, only four percent were compulsory (McBride, Benitez, & Sherraden, 2003). While this assessment excluded service-learning programs, the results suggest that compulsion may be a less distinguishing feature of service than is sometimes believed (Clotfelter, 1999).

Time commitment. Cnaan and Amroffell (1994) identified frequency and amount of time devoted to each volunteer episode as defining attributes. McBride, Benitez, and Sherraden (2003) found that 81 percent of civic service programs required a full-time commitment, equivalent to 35 hours or more per week. The remaining programs were flexible. Duration of the average service role was 7.3 months, and the median was five months.

Intended beneficiaries. Beneficiaries of volunteer programs may be strangers, neighbors, relatives, and even the volunteer, her or himself (Cnaan & Amroffell, 1994). Civic service programs are characterized by a dual focus on the servers and the served (McBride, Benitez, & Sherraden, 2003). Both are to benefit from the experience. Civic service programs are oriented toward the amelioration or prevention of a range of social and economic issues, e.g., poverty, natural disasters, preservation of the environment. Programs may be designed to promote social and economic development, support cultural integration and nation-building, and increase

citizenship behavior and skill development among the servers (Eberly & Sherraden, 1990; McBride, Benitez, & Sherraden, 2003; Sherraden, 2001).

Renumeration or recognition. Renumeration is a primary boundary for defining the contours of volunteerism (Carson, 1999). Altruism is considered a prerequisite, so if benefits beyond a sense of well-being and societal belonging accrue to the individual, then the basis of volunteerism may be questioned. Nevertheless, many programs reimburse volunteers for task-related expenses. In civic service programs, there is an explicit intention to affect the server, so the programs may provide formal recognition or rewards that invest in the capacity of the server. Some programs reward service with educational credit and scholarships (McBride, Benitez, & Sherraden, 2003). National service programs typically offer financial supports such as stipends to maximize participation. However, these stipends are never equivalent to market wages, thus, distinguishing full-time, compensated service from employment.

In sum, we suggest that civic service is distinct from traditional conceptions of volunteering. It is highly structured and formal. The time requirements are intense and long-term, and it is not always voluntary, which would place it on the fringe of voluntary action. We characterize this structured, programmatic volunteering as service. Based on this conceptualization, civic service can be defined as “*an organized period of substantial engagement and contribution to the local, national, or world community, recognized and valued by society, with minimal monetary compensation to the participant*” (Sherraden, 2001, p. 2). We attach the descriptor “civic” to connote that the action performed is essentially in the public realm, and it is not related to the military. We also refer to the person performing this action as a server instead of a volunteer.

Measuring Civic Service Comparatively

In McBride, Benitez, and Sherraden (2003), we identified 210 civic service programs in 57 nations. Unique aspects of the service experience were detailed. The programs took four primary forms, occurring at transnational, international, national, and local levels. Programs also targeted particular groups of servers, e.g., youth, skilled adults, retired elders, and those of faith. It was estimated that as many as 40 million servers may be engaged in service at any given time, a projection based on the average number of servers per program. (A few large international service programs represent the vast majority.) Service is largely just emerging. The average age of the programs was 21 years, suggesting that civic service is young, a developing institution in many countries.

Given that the purpose of this first global assessment was to identify operational aspects of civic service and the sample is likely not representative, caution should be taken in analysis and interpretation. Nevertheless, there are noteworthy findings. Developed nations tend to operate international service programs that are implemented in developing nations. African nations have more national service programs than other regions, and tend to use civic service as a means of training and employment for youth. In general, national service programs take a more developmental approach, balancing goals for the server and the served. Transnational exchange programs are oriented toward peace and understanding among servers from different nations.

The estimated global prevalence of programs and differences across nations suggest that civic service is a potentially important strategy. More should be known about this phenomenon. There is growing interest in measurement of volunteering at the national level (Dingle et al., 2001), and we suggest that civic service should also be the target of empirical measurement. A comparative framework could capture variability in program form, function, and outcomes. An institutional perspective on service roles and institutional linkages may provide this framework.

An Institutional Perspective on Linking Individuals to Service Roles

Service roles are created and offered by social institutions. The roles vary in number and type, based on demand and resources. The roles also differ in terms of their requirements, e.g., compulsion, time commitment, and eligibility criteria. Social institutions create and implement mechanisms that link individuals to the service role. The extent to which institutions facilitate engagement in service roles may depend on the expectations, access, incentives, information, and facilitation (Beverly & Sherraden, 1999; Morrow-Howell, Hinterlong, Sherraden, Tang, Thirupathy, & Nagchoudhuri, in press; Sherraden, Morrow-Howell, Hinterlong, & Rozario, 2001; Sherraden, Schreiner, & Beverly, 2003). These institutional linkages may in turn influence service performance and outcomes.

Expectations convey that service is useful, needed, and beneficial (Morrow-Howell et al., in press). Expectations about the role may be shared through marketing and public media campaigns as well as through peers and former servers. Another way to express expectations and promote the idea that service is desirable is by recognizing and applauding servers for their achievements and contributions, possibly through incentives or awards offered to them. Expectations create and reinforce norms and values, and may influence motivation to undertake the service role. The degree to which expectations are met may then influence longevity in the role.

Access relates to who is able to serve and how well the service role matches individual capacity. Access rests on role requirements and physical aspects of service performance. Access may be mediated by institutional incentives or facilitation. For example, without a stipend or an educational award, a low-income person may not be able to leave the labor market for a year of service. Institutions may provide accessible facilities and environments to potential servers with physical disabilities. Others may be flexible in terms of time commitment and activity placement for certain groups of people.

Incentives are inducements or rewards for service. Incentives are oriented toward the server, and may include educational credits or scholarships, community recognition, and increased skills and knowledge. Incentives or “compensation” for service may also be intangible, including personal satisfaction and social connections. From an institutional perspective, individuals would choose to perform service from the range of “allowable actions in light of the full set of incentives” (Ostrom, 1986, p.6). Incentives may motivate individuals to start or sustain role performance.

Information provided by service programs gives servers crucial details about the availability of service roles, service role performance, and expected service outcomes. Institutions may vary in the effort made to disseminate information and in the levels of specificity about the service role,

e.g., written job description (Morrow-Howell et al., in press). The content, degree of specificity, and methods of dissemination may influence servers' knowledge about the role they are to fill and what they may receive, thereby, mediating or reinforcing expectations and incentives.

Facilitation of the service role refers to support provided to the servers. What servers do and how they perform their tasks depend upon the structure of institutions (Neale, 1987). Training, reflection, and supervision may improve and sustain role performance. For example, the amount of formal training has been associated with the length of trainees' engagement in the program (Grossman & Furano, 1999).

When these institutional dimensions are paired with the conceptualization of service advanced above, a comparative framework can be erected for measuring the service role and the structure and nature of the service experience. But how should these ideas be phrased as questions and survey items? How can we best measure an individual's service performance, so as to compare service participation across nations and cultures? To inform these questions, we apply our conceptualization and institutional framework to large-scale surveys that assess volunteerism.

2. Methods

Scope

For this project, a priority was placed on identifying surveys that were national or international in scope and that assessed the meaning, status, or nature of volunteering for large numbers of individuals. As such, general census surveys within nations and surveys that assessed other topics besides volunteering were eligible for selection. A goal was geographic representation, including surveys from different regions of the world. Only English version surveys were reviewed, although some of these had been translated from other languages.

Selected Surveys

A total of 21 large-scale surveys were identified that asked about volunteering. No large-scale surveys were found that assessed civic service, specifically. These surveys were located through a variety of means, including keyword searches via the World Wide Web using terms such as volunteering, service, and survey. The United Nations' International Year of the Volunteer website was also searched, and several surveys were identified through related publications. Seventeen of the 21 surveys were retrieved. The researchers or authors of four surveys could not be identified or were not able to share the surveys.

Analysis

Content analysis was used in review of the surveys. Each item pertaining to volunteering was read and categorized based upon our conceptualization and institutional framework. Analytical categories included time commitment, activity and organizational host, perceived outcomes, and the institutional dimensions of expectations, access, information, incentives, and facilitation. Items that did not fall into these categories were noted as well.

3. Description of Studies

Scope and Purposes of the Surveys

Of the 17 surveys selected, four surveys were concerned exclusively with volunteerism.¹ Four addressed philanthropy and volunteering in the United States, Canada, and Hungary.² One survey had a larger focus on nonprofit or non-governmental organizations' outcomes, which also included questions about volunteering.³ The remaining eight surveys addressed a range of topics, including civic engagement, religion, education, crime, youth behavior and values, and retirement.⁴

Eleven of the surveys were developed and implemented in the United States (see Table 1). Two were implemented in the United Kingdom, and one each in Canada, Hungary, and Singapore. One international survey was implemented in 31 countries.

Service Role

Overall, the 17 surveys range widely in what they measure. Table 2 is a graphical summary of the aspects of volunteerism captured by each survey. Intensity is the most prevalent concept measured in 14 surveys. Duration of service is not widely captured (four surveys). Type of volunteer activity and the organizational host of the volunteer experience are assessed by 12 and 11 surveys respectively. Few questions are asked about volunteer facilitation (two surveys), societal benefits of volunteer activities (two surveys), and volunteer access (one survey).

Time commitment. Time commitment can be measured through intensity, frequency, and duration of the volunteer experience. The most common units of measurement are hours for intensity and weeks and month for duration. Weeks and months are also used to assess frequency. Multiple options are usually available when asking about frequency, from a one-time basis to three or more days a week.⁵ Both nominal and open-end questions are used to explore intensity and duration. Units are presented when respondents need to fill-in the blanks, e.g., number of weeks and months. Duration, frequency, and intensity are asked consecutively in a few surveys.⁶

Volunteer activities. Volunteering touches almost every aspect of human life. Volunteer activity is typically measured through the types of activities performed and organizational hosts

¹ Applied Research Corporation, 2000; National Center for Volunteering, 2002; UPS, 1998; U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2002.

² Hall, Knighton, Reed, Bussiere, McRae, & Brown, 1998; Hamilton & Hussian, 1998; Independent Sector, 1999a; Kuti, 1997.

³ Independent Sector, 1998b.

⁴ Hales, Henderson, Collins, & Becher, 2000; House, 1997; ISSP, 2000; Johnston, Bachman, & O'Malley, 2000; NHES, 1996; Peter D. Hart Research Associates, 1999b; Pew Partnership for Civic Change, 2002; U.S. Dept. of Commerce, 1990.

⁵ Applied Research Corporation, 2000; BMRB International, 1997; Hales et al., 2000; Independent Sector, 1999b; Johnston et al., 2000; NHES, 1996; National Household Education Statistics, 1996; Peter D. Hart Research Associates, 1999b; Pew Partnership for Civic Change, 2002; U.S. Dept. of Commerce, 1990.

⁶ Applied Research Corporation, 2000; BMRB International, 1998; NHES, 1996.

of the volunteer experience. Most surveys list a range of activities, types of organizational hosts, or groups of people with whom volunteers worked. Respondents are asked to identify applicable answers from lists of possibilities. Open-ended questions are also used.⁷

Voluntary activities include: providing direct services to individuals, such as helping the sick, elderly, or those who are poor; giving advice, information, or counseling; or providing supports such as caring, transportation, cooking, and cleaning. Some surveys ask about activities that involve the general public, for example, organizing events; serving on boards or advisory committees; building, maintaining, or repairing buildings or other physical structures; teaching or coaching; performing administrative work as well as engaging in emergency preparedness or relief. Other surveys ask about fundraising for organizations and protecting the environment or animals.⁸

Some surveys list topical areas of activities such as culture, sports, recreation, education, research, health, social services, emergency, environment, economic development, civil rights, legal services, international activities, overseas humanitarian efforts, etc.⁹

One survey asked about targeted groups that may be affected by volunteer efforts.¹⁰ Listed groups include children, youth, and the elderly and those who are disabled or former-convicts or substance-abusers. Groups might be very general such as an ethnic community or local community.

Auspice and organizational hosts. Many surveys query about the organizational host and offer a range of possible responses.¹¹ They may be either non-governmental organizations or governmental agencies. Types of organizational hosts may focus on different areas, from health and education to sports or recreation. Some surveys list areas of organizational activity for the respondent to choose from.

Institutional Capacity

None of the surveys explicitly address the issue of institutional capacity. However, based on our definition of the institutional dimensions, six surveys assess information and incentives, two assess facilitation, one assesses access, and none assess expectations.

Expectations. Expectations convey the need for volunteering, what one can anticipate the experience to be like, and the beneficial aspects of the volunteer experience. No items are identified that ask the volunteers to reflect back on what they knew before volunteering, which might have been available through public marketing or organizational materials. However, related content can be found below under “information.”

⁷ Kuti, 1997; National Household Education Statistics, 1996.

⁸ BMRB International, 1997; Hales et al., 2000; Hall et al., 1998; Independent Sector, 1998b; 1999b; NHES, 1996; Peter D. Hart Research, 1999b; Pew Partnership for Civic Change, 2002; U.S. Dept. of Commerce, 2002.

⁹ Applied Research Corporation, 2000; ISSP, 2000; Kuti, 1997.

¹⁰ National Benchmarking Survey on Volunteerism in Singapore, 2000.

¹¹ Independent Sector, 1999b.

Access. Access is measured through items that ask how well the “position” matched the volunteer’s skills or abilities, including how flexible the hosts are in matching activities or schedules.¹² Nominal questions are used, and respondents can typically choose answers from a list of options about accessibility. A five-point rating scale is used to assess the impact of volunteer role flexibility on volunteers. (More than half of the respondents were likely or highly likely to volunteer if the organizations were flexible about project assignments.)

Information. Information about the availability of the service role, role expectations, and the costs and benefits associated with volunteering may be provided through a variety of media or information sources. Respondents are asked to volunteer by friends, family members, and by organizations, including church, workplace, school, and social club.¹³ Individuals also actively seek volunteer opportunities at community and social service organizations and in the religious sector.¹⁴

Items ask how the respondents learn about what is “expected” in the given role, such as through a “job description” and the effect of the provided information. A list of information sources is given, such as mass media, community agencies, religious institutions, the Internet, and others. Dichotomous (yes/no) questions are used to determine whether a written job description is available, and then what respondents think of such a description. Four or five-point rating scales are used to assess respondents’ impressions about the effects of information.¹⁵

Incentives. Organizations or programs may reimburse and reward volunteers. Reimbursement is measured by compensation for out-of-pocket expenses, including meals and transportation.¹⁶ Dichotomous and multi-option questions are used to inquire about reimbursement. Rating scales are also used to ask about volunteers’ opinions or interests in stipends and in-kind compensation or benefits.¹⁷

Facilitation. Facilitation is measured by two surveys, through items assessing training, support, and supervision. Dichotomous questions are used to determine whether volunteers are supported and if they think they should receive some support.¹⁸ Multi-option questions prompt respondents to answer what kind of facilitation they received, while an open-ended question is used to ask what the greatest training need is. Types of training assessed include orientation, on-the-job training, and enrichment courses outside the volunteering area. Some respondents report that they need communication skills and continuous training, as well as training on patience, leadership, and technical and presentation skills.¹⁹

¹² Applied Research Corporation, 2000.

¹³ Independent Sector, 1999a.

¹⁴ Applied Research Corporation, 2000.

¹⁵ Applied Research Corporation, 2000; BMRB International, 1997; Pew Partnership for Civic Change, 2002.

¹⁶ Applied Research Corporation, 2000; BMRB International, 1997; Peter D. Hart Research Associates, 1999b.

¹⁷ Peter D. Hart Research Associates, 1999b.

¹⁸ Applied Research Corporation, 2000; BMRB International, 1997.

¹⁹ National Benchmarking Survey on Volunteerism in Singapore, 2000.

Perceived Outcomes

Individuals may benefit psychologically and socially from volunteer experience. Six surveys assess perceived benefits, and in addition, two surveys assess their perceptions of benefits for communities and society overall. Reasons given for volunteering also reflect how the volunteers perceive the benefits of the volunteering experience.²⁰ Four and five-point scales are used to assess the importance of perceived benefits and the level of agreement with the benefits gained.²¹ Responses are listed to prompt assessment of the benefits of volunteering.²²

Young persons report benefits from volunteer efforts with respect to improving academic achievement; developing career goals and exploring career options; learning how to respect others and being a good citizen; understanding people from diverse backgrounds; and developing leadership skills.²³ Other benefits include acquiring a sense of personal achievement and satisfaction; feeling helpful and valued; opportunities to develop interpersonal and communication skills, technical skills and organizational and managerial skills; and chances to make new contacts and friends, building social capital.²⁴

Outcomes can be good or bad. It is possible that volunteering has some negative effects, but we find no surveys that asked about negative effects. This may be a shortcoming in volunteerism research and should be avoided in future research on service. For example, researchers would want to know if service led to uncomfortable or traumatic personal experiences, if it caused economic hardship, or if it interfered with education or career development.

²⁰ Independent Sector, 1998a; 1999b.

²¹ Applied Research Association, 2000; BMRB International, 1997; Independent Sector, 1998a, 1999a.

²² Independent Sector, 1998b; Peter D. Hart Research Associates, 1999b.

²³ Hamilton & Hussian, 1998.

²⁴ Applied Research Association, 2000; BMRB International, 1997; Hall et al., 1998; Independent Sector; 1999b; Peter D. Hart Research Associates, 1999b.

4. Discussion

The 17 surveys indicate that there are common aspects used to assess the volunteering experience. Of the distinguishing characteristics listed by Cnaan and Amroffell (1994) and Cnaan, Handy, and Wadsworth (1996), time commitment, activities, host organizations, intended beneficiaries, outcomes, and remuneration or recognition were assessed as were institutional dimensions affecting the volunteer experience.

Based on these findings from volunteerism surveys, we offer specific recommendation regarding measurement of civic service, including item wording and response formats (see Appendix A for draft survey items to assess civic service).

Key Aspects of Civic Service

Auspice and host organizations. Service activities take place through non-governmental organizations, e.g., for-profit or nonprofit, religious or non-sectarian, secondary schools, universities, grassroots groups, etc., and through government agencies at the local, state, and federal levels. Considering cultural and political differences across nations, we suggest specifying the types of organizations that sponsor and host service as inclusively as possible. The Independent Sector (1999b) provides an extensive list of organizations. The individual would be asked to identify the organizational descriptor that best identifies the host of the service program. It is worthy of note that the host of the service program may be different than the sponsor per se. For example, AmeriCorps is a national service program sponsored by government and implemented by non-governmental organizations nationwide.

Compulsory/voluntary nature. None of the volunteerism surveys addressed the possible compulsory nature of the action. Since some civic service programs are known to be mandated (McBride, Benitez, & Sherraden, 2003), a survey on civic service should address this aspect. In fact, as argued by Eberly and Sherraden (1990), this may be a dimension more than a dichotomous choice.

Time commitment. Previous surveys have demonstrated that intensity, frequency, and to a lesser extent, duration, measure time commitment in volunteering. But civic service, as an intensive and structured form of volunteering, requires a more substantial commitment and longer duration of time (McBride, Benitez, & Sherraden, 2003). From review of the volunteer surveys, intensity can first be measured categorically as either full-time or part-time, then more specifically by the average hours spent volunteering over a certain period of time, e.g., six hours a day.

Frequency is characterized by the number of times one volunteers in a period of time, e.g., six hours a day, four days a week. Duration is the total length of time that an individual fills a volunteer role, e.g., a month or a year. Through these three measures, time commitment can be assessed for a definite versus indefinite volunteer position, e.g., six hours day, four days a week for nine months. Therefore, we suggest using hours per day as the measurement unit for intensity, days per week for frequency, and months or years for duration. Following a similar format used in other surveys, respondents would fill in the blanks based on the units.

Geographical scope. Scope, in terms of the level at which the service activity or implementation may be construed, was not addressed by surveys on volunteerism. The surveys assumed that the activity likely occurred within the individual's community. This assumption cannot be made in service. A line of questioning is necessary to determine whether the individual engaged in service in her or his community or in some other community within the nation, or in some other country.

Activities. Specific activities that one may engage in through volunteering or service are virtually non-exhaustive. As such, several of the volunteerism surveys asked about "domains" of activities. We recommend the same approach with service, e.g., recreation, education, and environment. The domain of activity can also be paired with who was targeted to participate in or receive the service, e.g., children, women, etc., for a more complete understanding of the service activity.

Institutional capacity. We suggest that expectations, access, information, incentives, and facilitation structure the service experience. Questions could assess the presence of various structures and supports. Respondents could be asked to consider the effects of institutional dimensions on their service participation and performance.

Expectations. Volunteerism surveys did not ask about expectations. We suggest that expectations about service can be assessed through items assessing why the individual decided to serve. Obviously compulsion may be one reason. But beyond this, the individual may feel that is expected of her or him as a citizen of the given nation or because they are privileged or have certain beliefs. Service may be an "expected" route to the labor market after secondary school or the university. These options may reflect societal norms. Others may participate in service because of the impact they believe they will have on others, which pertains to values. Outside of compulsion, these various options could be listed, and the respondent could be asked the degree to which he or she agrees with them.

Access. In general, the volunteerism surveys did not ask about access. Access can be measured through eligibility requirements. For example, if the server is required to know a certain language, then this service role may not be widely accessible. Other roles may implicitly require that the server not use a wheel-chair for mobility. Or accommodations may be provided that give individuals who use wheel-chairs access to the role, e.g., ramps, transportation, or off-site service through technology. Programs may link individuals to service roles by matching interests and talents or abilities with specific service activities. Respondents could be asked whether conditions or skills are required, and whether special provisions are made to give greater access to service roles.

Information. Information about service roles may be conveyed in many ways. The sanctioning body may communicate the specifics about the role. Other individuals may enter service roles because they were invited by a staff person at an organization, or because they learned about the possibility from a school career counselor or through the general media. We suggest that the individual be asked about the initial source of information regarding the service role. Information also relates to specific requirements and nature of the role. These details may be

provided through a job description. Respondents can be asked about whether a specific description was provided, what was described, and how informative it was.

Incentives. In the 17 surveys, the only “incentive” questions were about reimbursement. Service programs may provide more incentives and compensation than volunteer programs due to the more structured nature of service and the longer, more intensive commitment required by participants. Incentives could be reimbursement for expenses, stipends for housing and transportation, or post-service rewards such as educational grants or community awards and certificates (McBride, Benitez, & Sherraden, 2003). The server could be asked about a range of possible incentives and whether or not he or she received them. Additional lines of questioning could inquire about the perceived influence of incentives on expectations and access to the service role.

Facilitation. Only two of the volunteerism surveys assessed facilitation through items regarding training or training needs. Because of the nature of service roles, more intensive or targeted training may be necessary to orient or acculturate the server. In the global civic service assessment (McBride, Benitez, & Sherraden, 2003), we found that some programs provide language training or task-specific training. Other programs are focused on the learning process for the server, so they offer reflection sessions or mentoring. All programs provided some degree of supervision. Again, the range of possibilities could be listed, and the server could be asked if they were offered or not and if so, then how helpful they were.

Perceived outcomes. Perceived outcomes or benefits are measured in most of the volunteerism surveys. However, the benefits listed do not adequately capture the range of civic service goals, especially because civic service intends to affect the servers and the served. We suggest a wider range of possible benefits. For example, some programs are aimed at educational and employment training for the served and others strive to increase cultural integration in society. These possibilities could be listed, and the respondent asked the degree to which he or she believes they were achieved. Also, negative outcomes should be included in the survey. Every effort should be made to be objective and avoid a “happy” bias in assessing service outcomes.

Methodological Issues

Our suggested survey items could be incorporated within existing surveys or implemented as an independent survey. A complete survey instrument should also cover questions about socio-demographics, context, respondents’ attitudes toward service, and key social and/or political issues (Dingle et al., 2001). We have not yet focused on or recommended measurement of these topics.

The exact unit of analysis remains to be determined. In the volunteerism surveys, the respondents were asked about volunteer behavior—all volunteer behavior over a given time. This means that the individual might answer questions pertaining to multiple types of volunteer experiences. In civic service, the individual has participated in a distinct program. Civic service programs will vary in what they require and what the servers do. As such, in order to ideally assess the aforementioned dimensions pertaining to civic service, we recommend that the

individual be asked to focus on one service experience, only answering the questions for the service experience that is most recent, or perhaps the service experience of the longest duration.

Survey items pertaining to civic service will largely rely on nominal measurement to assess activities, host organizations, scope, institutional dimensions and perceived benefits. This was the case in the volunteerism surveys as well. Ratio level measurement should be used to assess time commitment. Ranked assessments or interval scales may be appropriate when asking individuals to assess importance, satisfaction, or agreement. Filter or contingency questions starting with dichotomous questions (yes/no) may be necessary, and open-end questions may help to identify a range of perceptions.

Many factors will determine the quality of data collected from surveys, such as the survey method (e.g., telephone, mail, or face-to-face interview) and the wording of questions. Validity and reliability are important criteria for any survey (Dingle et al., 2001; Hall, 2001). Ambiguity in the definition of aspects of service would compromise validity; while inadequate sampling, inaccurate information, and the tendency to illicit socially desirable answers could cause problems with reliability (Dingle et al., 2001; Hall, 2001). Comparing civic service across nations and cultures will necessitate that similar questions are answered by representative samples. Given that service is a fairly new phenomenon, perhaps quota sampling within younger cohorts should be used.

Conclusion

This is a first step in the conceptualization of civic service and development of applicable measures. Civic service is not the same as volunteerism, but it is a related phenomenon. In review of surveys assessing volunteerism, similarities include areas of activity, organizational hosts, and perceived benefits. Key differences are noted in time commitment, compulsion, and scope. Applying an institutional perspective we believe that basic aspects of the service role should be measured, as well as dimensions of the service institution that link the individual to the service role. There are no doubt other important aspects that should be measured as well. A major challenge will be to keep measures general enough to allow for applications in many different contexts, in order to describe and analyze service across nations and cultures.

References

- Anheier, H.K., & Salamon, L.M. (1999). Volunteering in cross-national perspective: Initial comparisons. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 62(4), 43-66.
- Applied Research Corporation (2000). *National benchmark survey on volunteerism in Singapore 2000*. Singapore: National Volunteer Center.
- Beverly, S.G., & Sherraden, M. (1999). Institutional determinants of saving: Implications for low-income households and public policy. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 28(4), 457-473.
- BMRB International (1997). *National Survey of Volunteering in the UK*. London: Institute for Volunteering Research.
- Carson, E.D. (1999). On defining and measuring volunteering in the United States and abroad. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 62(4), 67-71.
- Clotfelter, C.T. (1999). Amateurs in public service: Volunteering, service-learning, and community service. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 62(4), 1-16.
- Cnaan, R.A., & Amroffell, L. (1994). Mapping volunteer activity. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 23(4), 335-351.
- Cnaan, R.A., Handy, F., & Wadsworth, M. (1996). Defining who is a volunteer: Conceptual and empirical considerations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 25(3), 364-383.
- Davis Smith, J. (2002). *Civic service in Western Europe*. Presented at the Global Service Institute research conference, Toward a global research agenda on civic service, September 3, 2002.
- Dingle, A., Sokolowski, W., Saxon-Harrod, S.K.E., Smith, J.D., & Leigh, R. (Eds.) (2001). *Measuring volunteering: A practical Toolkit*. Retrieved December 21, 2001 from <http://www.independentsector.org/programs/research/toolkit/IYVToolkit.PDF>
- Eberly, D., & Sherraden, M. (Eds.), (1990). *The moral equivalent of war?: A study of non-military service in nine nations*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Grantmaker Forum on Community and National Service (2000). *The state of service-related research: Opportunities to build a field*. Berkeley, CA: The Grantmaker Forum on Community and National Service.
- Grossman, J.B., & Furano, K. (1999). Making the most of volunteers. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 62(4), 199-219.
- Hales, J., Henderson, L., Collins, D., & Becher, H. (2000). *2000 British Crime Survey*. London: National Centre for Social Research.

- Hall, M., Knighton, T., Reed, P., Bussiere, P., McRae, D., & Brown, P. (1998). *Caring Canadians, involved Canadians: Highlights from the 1997 National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participation*. Ottawa: Minister of Industry.
- Hall, M.H. (2001). Measurement issues in surveys of giving and volunteering and strategies applied in the design of Canada's National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 30(3), 515-526.
- Hamilton, M. & Hussian, A. (1998). American's teenage volunteers. Retrieved July 26, 2001 from <http://www.independentsector.org/programs/research/teenvolun1.pdf>
- Handy, F., Cnann, R.A., Brudney, J.L., Ascoli, U., Meijs, L.C.M.P., & Ranade, S. (2000). Public perception of "who is a volunteer?" An examination of the net-cost approach from a cross-cultural perspective. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 11(1), 45-65.
- Haven, J., & Schervish, P. (2001). The methods and metrics of the Boston Area Diary Study. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 30(3), 527-550.
- House, J. (1997). Americans' Changing Lives: Wave I and II, 1986 and 1989 (computer file). ICPSR version. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Survey Research Center (producer), 1994. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (distributor).
- Independent Sector (1998a). 1996 Teen Giving and Volunteering Survey Questionnaire. Washington, DC: Independent Sector.
- Independent Sector (1998b). 1997 Measures survey. Washington, DC: Independent Sector.
- Independent Sector (1999a). *Giving and volunteering in the United States: Executive summary*. Retrieved November 28, 2002 from <http://www.independentsector.org/GandV/default.htm>
- Independent Sector (1999b). 1999 Giving and volunteering survey instrument. Washington, DC: Independent Sector
- International Social Survey Program (ISSP). International Social Survey Program: Religion Ii, 1998 [Computer file]. Koeln, Germany: Zentralarchiv fuer Empirische Sozialforschung [producer], 2000. ICPSR version. Koeln, Germany: Zentralarchiv fuer Empirische Sozialforschung /Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributors], 2001.

- Johnston, Lloyd D., Jerold G. Bachman, and Patrick M. O'Malley. *Monitoring The Future: A Continuing Study Of American Youth (12th-Grade Survey)*, 2000 [Computer file]. Conducted by University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, Survey Research Center. ICPSR ed. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [producer and distributor], 2001.
- Kelen, A. (1985). Making pledges and requirements: Historical variants of "voluntary labor." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, XXVI(3-4), 209-219.
- Krishnamurthy, A., Prime, D., & Zimmeck, M. (2001). *Voluntary and community activities: Findings from the 2000 British Crime Survey*. London: Home Office. Retrieved August 16, 2001 from <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs/r142.pdf>
- Kuti, E. (1997). *Individual giving and volunteering in Hungary*. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute.
- McBride, A.M., Benitez, C., & Sherraden, M. (2003). *The forms and nature of civic service: A global assessment*, research report. St. Louis: Center for Social Development, Washington University.
- Menon, N., Moore, A., Sherraden, M. (2002). *Understanding service: Words in the context of history and culture*, working paper 02-1. St. Louis: Center for Social Development, Washington University.
- Morley, E., Vinson, E., & Harty, H. (2001). *Outcome measurement in nonprofit organizations: Current practices and recommendations*. Washington, DC: Independent Sector.
- Morrow-Howell, N., Hinterlong, J., Sherraden, M., Tang, F., Thirupathy, P., & Nagchoudhuri, M. (forthcoming). Institutional capacity for elder service. *Social Development Issues*.
- National Centre for Volunteering (2002). 1997 national survey of volunteering in the UK. Retrieved November 28, 2002 from <http://www.ivr.org.uk/nationalsurvey.htm>
- National Household Education Statistics (NHES) (1996). *The National Household Education Survey*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Neale, W.C. (1987). Institutions. *Journal of Economics Issues*, 21(3), 1177-1206.
- Ostrom, E. (1986). An agenda for the study of institutions. *Public Choice*, 48, 3-25.
- Perry, J.L., & Imperial, M.T. (2001). A decade of service-related research: A map of the field. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 30(3), 462-479.
- Peter D. Hart Research Associates (1999a). *The new face of retirement: Older Americans, civic engagement, and the longevity revolution*. San Francisco: Civic Ventures.

- Peter D. Hart Research Associates (1999b). *The new face of retirement nation survey*. Washington, DC: Civic Ventures.
- Pew Partnership for Civic Change (2002). *Ready willing & able—Citizens working for change*. Charlottesville, VA: Pew Partnership for Civic Change. Retrieved February 23, 2002 from http://www.pew-partnership.org/pubs/rwa/full_report/table_of_contents.html
- Salamon, L.M., & Sokolowski, W. (2001). *Volunteering in cross-national perspective: Evidence from 24 countries*, working paper of the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project, no. 40. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins Center for Civil Society Studies.
- Sherraden, M. (2001). *Civic service: Issues, outlook, institution building*, perspective. St. Louis: Center for Social Development, Washington University.
- Sherraden, M.S. (2001). *Developing transnational social policy: A North American community service program*, working paper 01-10. St. Louis: Center for Social Development, Washington University.
- Sherraden, M., & Eberly, D. (1990). Introduction. In D. Eberly and M. Sherraden (Eds.), *The moral equivalent of war: A study of non-military service in nine nations* (pp. 1-6). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Sherraden, M., Morrow-Howell, Hinterlong, J., & Rozario, P. (2001). Productive aging: Theoretical choices and directions. In N. Morrow-Howell, J. Hinterlong, & M. Sherraden (Eds.), *Productive aging: Concepts and challenges* (pp. 260-284). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University.
- Sherraden, M., Schreiner, M., & Beverly, S. (2003). Income, institutions, and saving performance in Individual Development Accounts. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 17(1), 95-112.
- United Parcel Service (UPS) (1998). *Managing volunteers*. Atlanta, GA: United Parcel Service.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census (2002). *Volunteering in the United States: Summary*. Retrieved January 21, 2003 from http://www.usafreedomcorps.gov/about_usafc/whats_new/announcements/20021218-2.asp
- U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. *Current Population Survey, May 1989: Multiple Job Holding, Flexitime, And Volunteer Work* [Computer file]. Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census [producer], 1990. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political Social Research [distributor], 1991.

U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Current Population Survey, September 2002: Volunteer Supplement [Computer file]. Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census [producer], 2002. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political Social Research [distributor], 2003.

Van Til, J. (1988). *Mapping the third sector*. Washington, DC: Foundation Center.

Wilson, J. & Musick, M. (1999). The effects of volunteering on the volunteer. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 62(4), 141-168.

Table 1. Selected Volunteerism Surveys (N=17)

Survey	Geographic Scope	Time Frame	Sample Size
International Social Survey Program: Religion II, 1998 (ISSP, 2000)	31 Countries	1998	39,034
1997 National Survey of Giving, Volunteering, and Participation (Hall et al., 1998)	Canada	1997	18,301
The 2000 British Crime Survey (Hales et al., 2000; Krishnamurthy, Prime, & Zimmeck, 2001)	England, Wales	2000	28,992
1997 National Survey of Volunteering in the UK (BMRB International, 1997; National Center for Volunteering, 2002)	United Kingdom	1997	1,486
The Survey of Individual Giving and Volunteering in Hungary (Kuti, 1997)	Hungary	1993	14,833
National Benchmarking Survey on Volunteerism in Singapore 2000 (Applied Research Corporation, 2000)	Singapore	2000	1,529
A Survey for the Pew Participation for Civic Change (Pew Partnership for Civic Change, 2002)	United States	2000	1,830
Americans' Changing Lives (House, 1997)	United States	1. 1986 2. 1989 3. 1994	1. 3,617 2. 2,867 3. 900
Current Population Survey, May 1989: Multiple Job Holding, Flexitime, and Volunteer Work (U.S. Dept. of Commerce, 1990)	United States	1989	71,000 households
Current Population Survey, September 2002: Volunteer Supplement (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2002; U.S. Dept. of Commerce, 2002)	United States	2002	About 60,000
Monitoring the Future: A Continuing Study of American Youth (12th-Grade Survey), 2000 (Johnston et al., 2000)	United States	Annually, since 1975	2,100 to 3,400 per year
National Household Education Survey on Civic Involvement (NHES, 1996)	United States	1996	8,044 youth, 2,250 adults, 9,389 parents
The 1996 Teen Giving and Volunteering Survey (Hamilton & Hussain, 1998; Independent Sector, 1998a)	United States	1996	1,007
The 1997 Independent Sector Measures Survey (Independent Sector, 1998b; Morley, Vinson, & Harty, 2001)	United States	1998	1,350
The 1999 Independent Sector Giving and Volunteering in the United States Survey (Independent Sector, 1999a, 1999b)	United States	1988-99 biennially	2,553 (in 1999)
The 1999 New Face of Retirement Nation Survey (Peter D. Hart Research Associates, 1999a, 1999b)	United States	1999	803
United Parcel Service (UPS) Volunteerism Survey (UPS, 1998)	United States	1998	2,430

Table 2. Conceptual Categories and Incidence Across Volunteerism Surveys

Survey	Time Commitment			Domain		Perceived Benefits		Institutional Dimensions			
	Intensity	Frequency	Duration	Activity type	Organization type	Individual benefits	Societal benefits	Access	Information	Incentives	Facilitation
1997 National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participation in Canada (Hall et al., 1998)	X			X	X	X			X	X	
1997 National Survey of Volunteering in the UK (BMRB International, 1997; National Center for Volunteering, 2002)	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X
A Survey for the Pew Participation for Civic Change (Pew Partnership for Civic Change, 2002)		X		X	X						
Americans' Changing Lives (House, 1997)	X				X						
Current Population Survey, May 1989: Multiple Job Holding, Flexitime, and Volunteer Work (U.S. Dept. of Commerce, 1990)	X				X						
Current Population Survey, September 2002: Volunteer Supplement (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2002; U.S. Dept. of Commerce, 2002)	X		X	X	X				X		
International Social Survey Program: Religion II, 1998 (ISSP, 2000)		X		X							
Monitoring the Future: A Continuing Study of American Youth (12th-Grade Survey), 2000 (Johnston et al., 2000)	X	X									
National Benchmarking Survey on Volunteerism in Singapore 2000 (Applied Research Corporation, 2000)	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
National Household Education Survey on Civic Involvement (NHES: 1996)	X	X	X	X							
1996 Teen Giving and Volunteering Survey (Hamilton & Hussain, 1998; Independent Sector, 1998a)	X				X	X			X		
1997 Independent Sector Measures Survey (Independent Sector, 1998b; Morley et al., 2001)	X			X			X				
1999 Independent Sector Giving and Volunteering in the United States Survey (Independent Sector, 1999a, 1999b)	X	X		X	X	X			X		

Table 2. Continued

Survey	Time Commitment			Domain		Perceived Benefits		Institutional Dimensions			
	Intensity	Frequency	Duration	Activity type	Organization type	Individual benefits	Societal benefits	Access	Information	Incentives	Facilitation
1999 New Face of Retirement Nation Survey (Peter D. Hart Research Associates, 1999a, 1999b)		X		X		X	X			X	
2000 British Crime Survey (Hales et al., 2000; Krishnamurthy et al., 2001)	X	X		X	X						
Survey of Individual Giving and Volunteering in Hungary (Kuti, 1997)	X			X	X					X	
United Parcel Service Volunteerism Survey (UPS, 1998)	X									X	
Totals	14	9	4	12	11	6	2	1	6	6	2

Appendix A Draft Civic Service Survey Items

A relevant introduction and instructions should be written based on context.

Basic Questions

Q1: [PLEASE CHECK THE CORRECT ANSWER] Have you ever participated in a service program that required you to serve full-time or over a long period of time for which you received little to no financial compensation? [Examples to be given based on the country in which the survey is implemented, e.g., AmeriCorps, Peace Corps, Australian Volunteer International, National Service Scheme in Ghana, Japanese Overseas Cooperation Volunteers, European Voluntary Service program, etc.]

1. Yes
0. No [if no, stop the survey]

Q2: Have you served in more than one service program in your lifetime?

1. Yes—go to Q3
0. No—go to Q5

Q3: Please list the name of the service program(s) you served in.

Q4: Please list the most long-term program you have served.

If you have served in more than one service program in your lifetime, when you answer the following items, please answer them for the service program that you served in for the longest period of time.

Compulsory/voluntary nature

Q5a: Did you serve in the program on a compulsory basis?

1. Yes
0. No

Q5b: [IF NO TO Q5A, THEN ASK] Did you serve in the program voluntarily?

1. Yes
0. No

Time Commitment

Q6: [PLEASE CHECK THE APPLICABLE ANSWER] Did you serve in the program on a part-time or full-time basis?

1. _____ Full-time [30 to 35 hours per week or more]
2. _____ Part-time [less than 30 hours per week]

Q7: [PLEASE CHECK THE APPLICABLE ANSWER] How long did you serve in the program from start to end? Please provide your answers in weeks, months, or years, whichever is most appropriate.

1. _____ weeks
2. _____ months
3. _____ year(s)

Q8: [PLEASE CHECK THE APPLICABLE ANSWER AND FILL IN THE BLANK WITH ACCURATE FIGURE] On average, how many hours per week did you serve?

1. _____ hours a week
2. Other, please specify _____

Service Activities and Host Organizations

Q9: Where did you serve?

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW REFUSED
1. Within your home community	1	0	8
2. Somewhere within the nation	1	0	8
3. In another country	1	0	8
4. Other, please specify _____			

Q10: [PLEASE CHECK ALL APPLICABLE ANSWERS] Listed in this table are examples of the different areas in which people perform service activities. Please indicate if you worked in this area or not.

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW REFUSED
1. Arts, culture, and humanities	1	0	8
2. Education	1	0	8
3. Environment	1	0	8
4. Health organizations	1	0	8
5. Human services	1	0	8

6. International/foreign aid	1	0	8
7. Political organizations/campaigns	1	0	8
8. Private and community foundations	1	0	8
9. Public/society benefit	1	0	8
10. Recreation	1	0	8
11. Religious-based	1	0	8
12. Employment or work-related	1	0	8
13. Youth development	1	0	8
14. Other, please specify			

Q11a: [PLEASE CHECK THE APPLICABLE ANSWER] Did a governmental organization or a non-governmental organization or association organize and sponsor the service program?

1. _____ Governmental organization
2. _____ Non-governmental organization
3. _____ Don't know/refused

Q11b: [PLEASE CHECK ALL APPLICABLE ANSWERS] What type of organization(s) did you work with in the service program? I will read a list of types. Please respond yes or no.

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW REFUSED
1. Human and social services	1	0	8
2. Education	1	0	8
3. Community development	1	0	8
4. Personal development	1	0	8
5. Environmental protection	1	0	8
6. Cultural Integration	1	0	8
7. Health Services	1	0	8
8. Employment/economic development	1	0	8
9. Infrastructure development	1	0	8
10. Cultural Heritage /Arts	1	0	8
11. Peace/Human Rights	1	0	8
12. Emergency Response	1	0	8
13. Other, please specify			

Q12: [PLEASE CHECK THE APPLICABLE ANSWERS] Which of the following groups did you work with while in the service program? I will read a list of groups. Please respond yes or no.

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW REFUSED
1. Children	1	0	8
2. Youth	1	0	8
3. Elderly	1	0	8
4. Women	1	0	8
5. Family	1	0	8
6. Lesbian, gay, bisexual, & transsexual	1	0	8
7. Disabled	1	0	8
8. Ethnic community	1	0	8
9. Substance-abusers	1	0	8
10. Former-convicts	1	0	8
11. Terminally ill	1	0	8
12. HIV/AIDS patients	1	0	8
13. Local community	1	0	8
14. Poor/impooverished	1	0	8
15. Other, please specify			

Expectations

Q13: Were you required to serve in the program, such as mandatory service by the government or required service by school or university?

1. _____ Yes
0. _____ No

Q14: [PLEASE CHECK ALL THE APPLICABLE ANSWERS] How did you first learn of the service program?

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW REFUSED
1. It is common knowledge in my country.	1	0	8
2. The program is discussed in the media.	1	0	8
3. Someone affiliated with the program told me about it.	1	0	8
4. I looked for information about this program myself.	1	0	8
5. Other, please specify			

Q15: [PLEASE CHECK ALL THE APPLICABLE ANSWERS] Prior to beginning the service position, what were your reasons for deciding to participate? I will list possible reasons. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the reason. Please respond using a scale from 1 to 5 with 5 being the highest level of agreement.

1. _____Service was expected of me as a citizen of the nation[NAME IT].
2. _____I wanted to give back to others.
3. _____I wanted to positively impact others and thought that I could through this program.
4. _____I wanted to receive the reimbursements or rewards that I knew the program gave for service completion.
5. Other, please specify _____

Access

Q16: [PLEASE CHECK THE APPLICABLE ANSWER] How did you first learn about the service position that you filled (not the program itself, but the specific position you filled)?

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW REFUSED
1. Approached by the organization Go to Q16	1	0	8
2. Was asked by someone - Go to Q17	1	0	8
3. Looked for by yourself Go to Q18	1	0	8
4. Some other way, please specify _____			

Q17: [PLEASE CHECK THE APPLICABLE ANSWERS] How did the organization approach you?

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW REFUSED
1. An employee of the organization asked me	1	0	8
2. Through newsletters of organizations	1	0	8
3. Direct invitation from organizations/programs	1	0	8
4. Other, please specify _____			

Q18: [PLEASE CHECK THE APPLICABLE ANSWERS] Who asked you to participate in service program?

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW REFUSED
1. Friend	1	0	8
2. Relative	1	0	8
3. Co-worker	1	0	8
4. Someone in the program	1	0	8
5. Boss or employer	1	0	8

6. Someone else, please specify	1	0	8
7. Don't know			

Q19: [PLEASE CHECK THE APPLICABLE ANSWERS] Which of the following were eligibility criteria for your participation in the service program? I will read a list of criteria. Please respond yes or no. [IF SERVICE WAS MANDATORY, SKIP]

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW REFUSED
1. Age	1	0	8
2. Race	1	0	8
3. Gender	1	0	8
4. Disability	1	0	8
5. Religion	1	0	8
6. Income	1	0	8
7. Student status	1	0	8
8. Organizational affiliation	1	0	8
9. Geographical location	1	0	8
10. Language	1	0	8
11. Skills	1	0	8
12. Other, please specify			

Q20: [PLEASE CHECK ALL THE APPLICABLE ANSWERS] After enrollment, which of the following were you allowed to choose by yourself?

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW REFUSED
1. Time schedule	1	0	8
2. Service task	1	0	8
3. Other, please specify			
4. [IF NO TO BOTH, CONFIRM] no choice by oneself	1	0	8

Q21: [PLEASE CHECK THE APPLICABLE ANSWER] Did the service position match your interests?

1. _____ Yes
2. _____ No
3. _____ Don't know

Q22: [PLEASE CHECK THE APPLICABLE ANSWER] Do you think that your level of skill when you started the position was appropriate for what you were assigned to do?

1. _____ Yes
2. _____ No
3. _____ Don't know

Information

Q23: [PLEASE CHECK THE APPLICABLE ANSWER] Were you provided with a “job description” that told you about the service position?

- 1. Yes [GO TO Q23]
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

Q24: [PLEASE CHECK ALL THE APPLICABLE ANSWER] What information was included in the description?

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW REFUSED
1. Eligibility requirements	1	0	8
2. Benefits that may come from engaging in the service activity	1	0	8
3. Responsibilities for the service position	1	0	8
4. Relationships with the paid staff in the organization	1	0	8
5. The person(s) to whom the you would be accountable during service	1	0	8
6. The potential risks that may be involved in engaging in the service activity	1	0	8
7. Other, please specify _____			

Incentives

Q25: [PLEASE CHECK THE APPLICABLE ANSWER AND SPECIFY THE ANSWER] Did you receive a stipend for living expenses during service?

- 1. Yes - How much? _____ In what currency? _____
- 2. No

Q26: [PLEASE CHECK THE APPLICABLE ANSWER] How important do you think it is to receive a stipend for living expenses during service? [READ OPTIONS.]

- 1. Very important
- 2. Important
- 3. Neutral
- 4. Not important
- 5. Not important at all
- 6. Don't know

Q27: [PLEASE CHECK THE APPLICABLE ANSWER AND SPECIFY THE ANSWER] Were you compensated during service for incidental expenses, such as mileage, lunch, or supplies related to the activity?

1. Yes - For what? How much? _____
2. No

Q28: [PLEASE CHECK THE APPLICABLE ANSWER] Was transportation provided for you between your service placement and the place where you live?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not applicable
4. Don't know

Q29: [PLEASE CHECK THE APPLICABLE ANSWER] Did you receive health insurance through the service program while you served?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not applicable, the program did not offer health insurance
4. Don't know

Q30: [PLEASE CHECK THE APPLICABLE ANSWER AND SPECIFY THE ANSWER] Were you given a reward after you completed service, such as educational grant to attend school?

1. Yes - what was it? _____
2. No

Q31: [PLEASE CHECK ALL THE APPLICABLE ANSWER] Were you recognized or honored by the program? Check all that apply.

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW REFUSED
1. Received a thank-you letter	1	0	8
2. Acknowledged my service in public media outlet	1	0	8
3. Certificate of recognition	1	0	8
4. Published my profile in newsletter	1	0	8
5. Others, please specify _____			

Facilitation

Q32: [PLEASE CHECK THE APPLICABLE ANSWER] Did you receive training prior to or during service?

1. Yes
2. No

Q33: [PLEASE CHECK ALL THE APPLICABLE ANSWER] If you received training, what kind of training was it?

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW REFUSED
1. An orientation or briefing	1	0	8
2. Skills or specialized training	1	0	8
3. On-the-job training	1	0	8
4. Enrichment courses outside service area (e.g., languages, interpersonal skills, communication skills)	1	0	8
5. Other, please specify_____			

Q34: [PLEASE CHECK THE APPLICABLE ANSWER] Do you agree that the training met your needs?

1. _____ Strongly agree
2. _____ Agree
3. _____ Disagree
4. _____ Strongly disagree
5. _____ Don't know

Q35: [PLEASE CHECK ALL THE APPLICABLE ANSWER] Did you receive any of the following support from your supervisor?

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW REFUSED
1. Technical support	1	0	2
2. Information referral	1	0	2
3. Consultation with a specific problem met during the service activity	1	0	2
4. Other, please specify_____			

Q36: [PLEASE CHECK THE APPLICABLE ANSWER] Did supervision help you in your service provision?

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree
5. Don't know

Q37: [PLEASE CHECK THE APPLICABLE ANSWER SPECIFY THE ANSWER] Were you provided with the advice or support you thought was needed

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

Q38: [PLEASE CHECK THE APPLICABLE ANSWER AND SPECIFY THE ANSWER] Were you provided with a formal opportunity to integrate the service experience with learning?

1. Yes - How? _____
2. No
3. Don't know

Perceived Benefits

Q39: [PLEASE CHECK THE APPLICABLE ANSWER] Did you feel you have benefited from the service experience?

1. Yes
2. No-go to Q42
3. Don't know-go to Q40

Q40: [PLEASE CHECK THE APPLICABLE ANSWER] What benefits do you believe you gained from the service experience? Rate the following statements on a scale of 1=Strongly agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Disagree, and 5=Strongly disagree.

	Strongly agree 1	Agree 2	Neutral 3	Disagree 4	Strongly disagree 5
1. Explored career opportunities					
2. Improved or acquired skills					
3. Explored job opportunities or career options					
4. Advanced education					
5. Focused purpose in life and a sense of accomplishment					
6. Increased sense of accomplishment					
7. Improved self-perception					
8. Learned about community					
9. Learned about people from different cultural, ethnic, socio-economic backgrounds					
10. Met people and made friends					
11. Promoted maturity and personal autonomy					
12. Increased desire to volunteer again					
13. Increased interest in political issues					
14. Other, please specify					

Q41: [PLEASE CHECK THE APPLICABLE ANSWER] Did you expect any of these benefits before you participated?

1. _____ Yes
2. _____ No

Q42: [PLEASE CHECK THE APPLICABLE ANSWER] Do you think that the service program achieved its intended goals?

1. _____ Yes
2. _____ No
3. _____ Don't know

Q43: [PLEASE CHECK THE APPLICABLE ANSWER] Do you believe that those who you worked with or served benefited from the activities you engaged in or implemented?

1. _____ Yes
2. _____ No
3. _____ Don't know

Q44a: [PLEASE CHECK THE APPLICABLE ANSWER] Do you believe that the service program. . .

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW REFUSED
1. Promoted cultural understanding	1	0	8
2. Created/improved public facilities	1	0	8
3. Promoted sustainable land use	1	0	8
4. Improved well-being of individuals	1	0	8
5. Improved health	1	0	8

Q44b: [PLEASE RECORD RESPONSE] Please share any other positive or negative outcomes of the service program.